



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/513,010	02/25/2000	Jiandong Huang	H16-26156 US	6987
128	7590	06/02/2006	EXAMINER	
HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC. 101 COLUMBIA ROAD P O BOX 2245 MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245			PUENTE, EMERSON C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2113	

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/513,010	Applicant(s) HUANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Emerson C. Puente	Art Unit 2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 31-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 31-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 February 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-10 and 31-52 have been examined.

This action is made **Non-Final**. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection for claims 1-10 and 31 presented in this Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 32-40 and 42-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,153,874 of Kohno et al. referred hereinafter “Kohno”.

In regard to claims 32 and 43, Kohno discloses:

determining the state of a primary network connection between the network interface and the network interfaces of other network nodes (see figure 3 and 4; see column lines 35-52);

determining the state of a redundant network connection between the network interface and the network interfaces of other network nodes (see figure 3 and 4; column 3 lines 35-52);

selecting either the primary network connection or the redundant network connection for communication with each pair of network nodes, such that the network connection selected is selected independently based on the determined network states for each other network nodes (see column 3 lines 5-7 and 20-30).

In regard to claims 33 and 44, Kohno discloses:

a network status table that indicated results of the determination of the state of the primary and redundant network connections between the computer network interface and the interface of other network nodes (see figure 4).

In regard to claims 34 and 45, Kohno discloses

wherein the network status table comprises data representing network status based on data received at a node from other network nodes (see figure 4 and column 3 lines 40-47).

In regard to claims 35 and 46, Kohno discloses

wherein the data received at a node from other network nodes comprises a diagnostic message (column 3 lines 3-12).

In regard to claims 36 and 47, Kohno discloses

wherein the data received at a node from other network nodes comprises data representing the ability of the other nodes to receive data from other different network nodes (see figure 4 and column 3 lines 43-47).

In regard to claims 37, 38, 48, and 49, Kohno discloses

wherein the network status table comprises data representing network status based on a node's ability to send data to other nodes (see figure 4 and column 3 lines 43-47).

In regard to claims 39 and 50, Kohno discloses

wherein selecting the primary network connection or redundant network connection for communication between each pair of network nodes comprises selecting the primary network connection if the state of the primary network connection is determined to be operable and selecting the redundant connection if the state of the primary network connection is determined to be inoperable. Kohno states the use of a switch means such that the receiving circuit is

Art Unit: 2113

connected to a normal transmission line when abnormality is decided (see column 3 lines 25-30), indicating a switch from the primary network connection to a secondary network connection when the primary connection is inoperable or abnormal.

In regard to claims 40 and 51, Kohno discloses

wherein selecting the primary or redundant network connection for communication between each pair of network nodes comprises selecting the primary network connection to transmit data if the state of the primary network connection is determined to be operable to transmit data, selecting the primary network connection to receive data if the state of the primary network connection is determined to be operable to receive data, selecting the redundant network connection to transmit data if the state of the primary network connection is determined to be inoperable to transmit data, and selecting the redundant network connection to receive data if the state of the primary network connection is determined to be inoperable to receive data. Kohno states the use of a switch means such that the receiving circuit is connected to a normal transmission line when abnormality is decided (see column 3 lines 25-30), indicating a switch from the primary network connection to a secondary network connection when the primary connection is not operable or abnormal. Thus, it is implied that there is a primary network connection to transmit and receive data upon determination that the network connection is operable and a redundant network connection to transmit and receive data upon determination the network connection is inoperable.

In regards to claim 42, Kohno discloses a computer network interface wherein

determining the state of connections between each pair of network nodes comprises determination of whether each node in a pair of network nodes can send data to the other node

Art Unit: 2113

and can receive data from the other node in the pair. Kohno states the use of an abnormal test circuit to check if the transmission line is normal or operable, thus determining whether each node in a pair can send and receive data to the other (see column 2 lines 58-69 and column 3 lines 1-4). Upon determination that the transmission line between a pair is abnormal or inoperable, it is understood that data cannot be sent and received between each node in the pair.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § **103(a)** as being unpatentable over Kohno in view of US Patent No. 6,192,414 of Horn.

In regards to claims 1, Kohno discloses:

determining the state of a primary network connection between each pair of network nodes (see figure 3 and 4; see column lines 35-52);

determining the state of a redundant network connection between each pair of network nodes (see figure 3 and 4; column 3 lines 35-52);

selecting either the primary network connection or the redundant network connection, but not both, for receiving data between each pair of network nodes, such that the network path

Art Unit: 2113

selected to be used to communicate is selected independently based on the determined network states for each pair of network nodes (see column 3 lines 5-7 and 20-30).

However, Kohno discloses a communication network which send signals via both transmission lines (see column 3 lines 20-30) and thus fails to disclose selecting either the primary network connection or the redundant network connection, but not both, for sending and receiving data between each pair of network nodes.

Horn discloses:

a known communication network system which determines the state of a primary network connection between each pair of network nodes, determines the state of a redundant network connection between each pair of network nodes, and selects either the primary network connection or the redundant network connection, but not both, for receiving data between each pair of network nodes (see column 3 lines 55-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Kohno in a system that selects either the primary network connection or the redundant network connection, but not both, for receiving data between each pair of network nodes, as disclosed Horn. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated because Horn is concerned with determining problems with network connections (see column 3 lines 55-60) and incorporating a abnormality check circuit which receives signals from other station to determine with connections are normal and abnormal (see column 3 lines 31-34), as per teaching of Kohno, helps an operator to easily estimate the location and cause of the fault (see column 3 lines 50-52).

In regards to claims 2, Kohno discloses:

building a network status table that indicated results of determining the state of the primary and redundant network connections between each pair of network nodes (see figure 4).

In regards to claim 3, Kohno discloses a method wherein the network status table comprises data representing network status based on data received at a node from other network nodes (see figure 4 and column 3 lines 40-47).

In regards to claim 4, Kohno discloses :

wherein the data received at a node from other networked nodes comprises a diagnostic message (column 3 lines 3-12).

In regards to claim 5, Kohno discloses:

wherein the data received at a node from other network nodes comprises data representing the ability of the other nodes to receive data from other different network nodes (see figure 4 and column 3 lines 43-47).

In regards to claims 6 and 7, Kohno discloses:

wherein the network status table comprises data representing network status based on a node's ability to send data to other nodes (see figure 4 and column 3 lines 43-47).

In regards to claim 8, Kohno discloses:

wherein selecting the primary or redundant network connection for communication between each pair of network nodes comprises selecting the primary network connection if the state of the primary network connection is determined to be operable and selecting the redundant connection if the state of the primary network connection is determined to be inoperable. Kohno states the use of a switch means such that the receiving circuit is connected to a normal transmission line when abnormality is decided (see column 3 lines 25-30), indicating a

Art Unit: 2113

switch from the primary network connection to a secondary network connection when the primary connection is inoperable or abnormal.

In regards to claim 9, Kohno discloses:

wherein selecting the primary or redundant network connection for communication between each pair of network nodes comprises selecting the primary network connection to transmit data if the state of the primary network connection is determined to be operable to transmit data, selecting the primary network connection to receive data if the state of the primary network connection is determined to be operable to receive data, selecting the redundant network connection to transmit data if the state of the primary network connection is determined to be inoperable to transmit data, and selecting the redundant network connection to receive data if the state of the primary network connection is determined to be inoperable to receive data. Kohno states the use of a switch means such that the receiving circuit is connected to a normal transmission line when abnormality is decided (see column 3 lines 25-30), indicating a switch from the primary network connection to a secondary network connection when the primary connection is not operable or abnormal. Thus, it is implied that there is a primary network connection to transmit and receive data upon determination that the network connection is operable and a redundant network connection to transmit and receive data upon determination the network connection is inoperable.

In regards to claim 31, Kohno discloses:

wherein determining the state of connections between each pair of network nodes comprises determination of whether each node in a pair of network nodes can send data to the other node and can receive data from the other node in the pair. Kohno states the use of an

Art Unit: 2113

abnormal test circuit to check if the transmission line is normal or operable, thus determining whether each node in a pair can send and receive data to the other (see column 2 lines 58-69 and column 3 lines 1-4). Upon determination that the transmission line between a pair is abnormal or inoperable, it is understood that data cannot be sent and received between each node in the pair.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohno in view of Horn and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,434,117 of Momona.

In regards to claim 10, Kohno in view of Horn discloses all the claimed subject matter except wherein selecting a connection for sending and receiving data between each pair of network nodes comprises selecting a connection for sending and receiving data from a first node to one or more connected intermediate nodes and selecting a connection for sending and receiving data from an intermediate node to a second node

However, Momona discloses wherein selecting a connection for sending and receiving data between each pair of network nodes comprises selecting a connection for sending and receiving data from a first node to one or more connected intermediate nodes and selecting a connection for sending and receiving data from an intermediate node to a second node. He discloses the use of one or more intermediate nodes as a repeater (see figure 1 and column 4 lines 5-11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kohno and Horn with Momona such that selecting a connection for sending and receiving data between each pair of network nodes comprises selecting a connection for sending and receiving data from a first node to one or more connected

Art Unit: 2113

intermediate nodes and selecting a connection for sending and receiving data from an intermediate node to a second node. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification because Kohno in view of Horn discloses the use of repeaters (see column 3 lines 35-42 of Kohno) and having intermediate nodes wherein each intermediate node acts as repeaters, as per teachings of Momona, would lessen distortion or even possibly remove the need to have repeaters per transmission line between each node.

Claims 41 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohno in further view of Momona.

In regard to claim 41 and 52, Kohno discloses all the claimed subject matter except wherein selecting a connection for sending and receiving data between each pair of network nodes comprises selecting a connection for sending and receiving data from a first node to one or more connected intermediate nodes and selecting a connection for sending and receiving data from an intermediate node to a second node.

However, Momona discloses a computer network interface wherein selecting a connection for sending and receiving data between each pair of network nodes comprises selecting a connection for sending and receiving data from a first node to one or more connected intermediate nodes and selecting a connection for sending and receiving data from an intermediate node to a second node. He discloses the use of one or more intermediate nodes as a repeater (see figure 1 and column 4 lines 5-11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kohno and Momona such that selecting a connection for

Art Unit: 2113

sending and receiving data between each pair of network nodes comprises selecting a connection for sending and receiving data from a first node to one or more connected intermediate nodes and selecting a connection for sending and receiving data from an intermediate node to a second node. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the modification because Kohno discloses the use of repeaters (see column 3 lines 35-42) and having intermediate nodes wherein each intermediate node acts as repeaters, as per teachings of Momona, would lessen distortion or even possibly remove the need to have repeaters per transmission line between each node.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

See PTO-892.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emerson C. Puente whose telephone number is (571) 272-3652. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert W. Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2113

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ecp
5/29/06


BRYCE P. BONZO
PRIMARY EXAMINER